

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT CAPITAL FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE  
SERVICES APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Monday, February 5, 2001, 2:00 p.m.**

**Room 131, State Capitol Building**

Members Present:     Rep. Gerry Adair, Co-Chair  
                              Sen. Beverly Evans, Co-Chair  
                              Sen. Mike Dmitrich  
                              Sen. John Valentine  
                              Rep. Jeff Alexander  
                              Rep. Roger Barrus  
                              Rep. Ralph Becker  
                              Rep. DeMar “Bud” Bowman  
                              Rep. David Clark  
                              Rep. Brent Goodfellow  
                              Rep. Ty McCartney  
                              Rep. Loraine Pace

Members Absent:     Rep. Greg Curtis  
                              Rep. Kevin Garn

Staff Present:        Kevin Walthers, Fiscal Analyst  
                              Jonathon Ball, Fiscal Analyst  
                              Sharon Johnson, Secretary

Committee Co-Chair Adair called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.  
All Capital projects are listed under Tab 3, Capital Budget Book.

**1. Utah State University**

Mr. Walthers addressed the proposed USU Engineering Building. This building would be constructed using a standardized classroom building plan. There will be four buildings constructed at state universities using the same model. The construction figures for USU include \$10 million in donated funds. There is intent language on page 19 for USU regarding these donated funds. The USU heating plant needs are well established and Mr. Walthers explained the Engineering Building needs. The plan is to build a new addition to the existing facility and the main building will then be renovated after which the unsafe classroom portion will be torn down. The analyst's recommendation is for \$17,294,400 to be allocated for construction this year with \$5,943,500 placed in escrow. The \$10 million in donated funds will fund the remodeling portion. The intent language requests that State funds to be used on the remodel not be expended until the entire \$10 million is collected.

Kermit Hall, President USU, Fred Hunsaker, VP Administrative Services USU, and Bruce Bishop, Dean College of Engineering USU, addressed the committee. Pres. Hall addressed the

standards and benchmarks that USU is striving to achieve. He listed the engineering building and the renovation of the heat plant as their top priorities. Pres. Hall reported on the progress that was made on the heat plant last year and addressed the remaining appropriation. He then discussed the limited facilities at USU for engineering students and that the University is unable to safely meet the needs of the students.

Rep. Adair commented on the increase in the number of graduates and the increase in the number of jobs that will be generated in Utah once the building is completed. Rep. Pace commented on the projects at the University and the need to complete them. She stated that the bandaids applied in the past are not sufficient for current needs. Rep. Goodfellow had questions about the coal that has been used for the boilers in the heat plant and the increasing cost of natural gas. Mr. Hunsaker responded that natural gas is still better environmentally and the new facility has co-generation ability to switch between fuel sources. Rep. Curtis asked for information regarding accreditation and what disciplines are in the college of engineering. Rep. Becker addressed private funding needs and how easily matching funds will be raised.

## **2. University of Utah**

Mr. Walthers presented the priority projects at the University of Utah. Their number one request is also the engineering building and not the Museum of Natural History remodel which was at the top of the list last year. The analyst's projected cost to remodel the Merrill Engineering is \$4.6 million. This is less than DFCM's estimate. While it is a two phase project it is not phase funded. Funding will be provided at one time and phase one of the construction is to remodel the existing building. The second phase is construction of a \$28 million addition which would provide needed space and would address ADA concerns. The University is pursuing outside donations and their business plan states that if the state provides seed money it improves their fund raising efforts. There is intent language at the bottom of page 21 similar to Utah State's requiring donated money to be available for the State expends its funds.

Dave Pershing, Sr. VP Academic Affairs U of U and Pres. Bernard Machen, University of Utah President, related the history of engineering building project. This remodel is not a new initiative but has been under consideration for six years. For construction of the new engineering section the state component is to be \$15 million of the projected \$45 million. The University feels that having the entire \$30 million escrow in hand, as the intent language states, at the outset is too difficult. They suggest that the state's \$15 million escrow be held until \$13 million is actually raised. The University has a good record of fund raising and would be able to get the additional \$17 million donated for equipment later.

Sen. Evans asked about assurances of fund raising success if the escrow is not held as long. The response was that the U has a good track record and history in gathering donations. Rep. Curtis asked which disciplines are in the College of Engineering and would the building be exclusively

for engineering and computer science. Rep. Adair asked about the students now being turned away due to limited facilities. Sen. Evans asked about the number of graduate students and the percentage of those that are Utah Citizens. She also commented on incentives to get Utah citizens in graduate programs. Rep. Goodfellow commented on the number of SLCC students that feed into the U.'s engineering program. Rep. Clark asked for clarification of raising funds and the state's match and mentioned the quality of incoming students and the addition of qualified faculty. Rep. Pace brought up the issue of finding faculty and the cost of retaining them.

Mr. Walthers responded to the escrow concerns of the University and that no specific plan has been presented for the building. When that work is done it might make a difference in the state's plans for managing the escrow. He clarified that the structural remodel is fully funded but the furnishings have been reduced.

### **3. Weber State University-Davis facility**

Paul Thompson, Pres. WSU, responded to Rep. Curtis' questions regarding the disciplines included in the engineering program and the accreditation status of WSU's programs. Pres. Thompson stated that the Davis campus would focus on engineering technology and information systems but still would provide some general education.

Governor Leavitt addressed the committee regarding higher education facilities in the state and the origination of his science and engineering education proposal. He stressed the need to keep the economy growing and technology jobs. These building proposals result from the need to stimulate the economy and expand now, not four years from now. Rep. Goodfellow commented on feeding students to college of engineering from community colleges. The Governor responded that pre-engineering is important from WSU, community colleges, junior high and high schools.

Pres. Thompson updated the committee on the Visual Arts building at WSU, it is on schedule and under budget. He addressed the population growth in Davis County and the continuing education that is provided through WSU and their need to expand their services in Davis county .

Mr. Walthers recommendation on page 20 addresses his concern that the estimate of \$24 million is too high when compared with the \$22 million facility built at SLCC which has expensive components such as a heat plant and utility tunnel. Sen. Evans commented on the money needed to the desired programs at the school and wondered if Higher Education will be able to cover this. Pres. Thompson answered those concerns. Rep. Adair commented about using a prototypical design and if a heat plant will be needed in Davis County. Blake Court, DFCM, answered that they anticipate having a free standing building without a heat plant or tunnels for

now. However they have designed the building for that when the campus expands.

#### **4. Southern Utah University**

The Analyst informed the committee that the SUU Education Building, a converted Middle School, is not adequate. It is expensive to maintain and would cost more than its worth to make it usable for the University. His recommendation is that the building be demolished. There are also asbestos problems to be addressed there. The Building Board has made a request to replace the existing building with a new one at the cost of \$17.8 million. It would be a rush to fit it in with the other package buildings being done at this time. Mr. Walthers explained that Old Main and the Braithwaite building are both in need of extensive repair. His recommendation is to use the extra money to repair these and reduce the maintenance backlog. The Teacher Education Building could be dealt with later which would give them time to develop a better plan for the middle school space.

Steve Bennion, President SUU, and Bruce Barker, Dean College of Education SUU, addressed their need for a Teacher Education building. There is a growing need for teachers in Utah in the next 10 years. SUU is the second largest producer of teachers in Utah. The college of Education is currently spread out across the campus and the offices in Old Main are small and antiquated. Pres. Bennion commented that the proposed building would benefit both public education and higher education. The teachers at SUU need to be qualified to teach in today's society with technology instruction.

#### **5. UVSC**

Mr. Walthers addressed the utilization of rooms at UVSC. He recommends \$18.7 million for a new building as part of the package to deal with the growth. Pres. Kerry Romesburg introduced Dr. Brad Cook, VP, who further explained the needs of UVSC. He presented information that demonstrated UVSC's lack of adequate facilities and how this classroom project will help to alleviate these problems. Rep. Adair commented on using a prototype and how UVSC can implement the design based on the campus' architectural theme. Mr. Byfield commented on that theme at UVSC and how DFCM can incorporate that theme into the building while still using the modular design. Pres. Romesburg commented on enrollment being limited and the number of students that they need to turn away. Sen. Evans inquired about the proposed location of the building and parking facilities. Rep. Pace asked about the percentage of students who come from outside of Utah County. Pres. Romesburg replied that 74% of the students are from Utah county and 9% are from out of state. She also commented on the design and sometimes inefficient use of space when following the architectural theme at UVSC. Pres. Romesburg replied that space efficiency is of primary concern to the college as well and they are currently taking steps to increase that utilization. Rep. Barrus commented on projected depreciation in year 2020 and Norm Tarbox, Assoc. Commissioner Higher Education, addressed that. It was explained that the

core space at UVSC is now 25-30 years old and will need to be renewed or replaced by 2020. Sen. Evans commented on the architecture and maintaining functionality and Rep. Adair commented on the number of students that transfer to BYU. Mr. Walthers also commented that UVSC's long-range mission may need to be addressed in dealing with its growth.

## **6. CEU**

Mr. Walthers identified priorities and programs recommended for CEU. The top two would be the Heat Plant and the CEU main building. The main building needs to be replaced and repair is not an option. It has settled, is unsafe and has only one central exit that is a fire hazard. The building could be replaced for \$10.8 million using package savings.

Pres. Grace Jones, addressed the committee. She knows that the legislature is familiar with the building and its needs. Sen. Evans and Dmitrich commented on the age and status of the building. Rep. Adair stated that the students at CEU need to be educated and have similar opportunities for all students in the state. Pres. Jones stated that it will be an instructional building which will allow the college to unify programs. Rep. Pace asked about the new location of the Administrative offices. Pres. Jones replied that Administration will be in reallocated space of the current science building.

The Analyst referred to a DFCM handout of how package savings could work. He explained the handout and the alternatives. His recommendation is for alternative 2. The total numbers vary from DFCM and Analyst because the analyst has removed percent for arts and applied that savings to the maintenance backlog. The analyst commented that higher education buildings may have opportunities to address artwork in the building on their own. He stated that planning money at WSU has been deleted because the work is already done.

## **7. Dixie College**

Robert Huddleston, Pres. Dixie College, and Stan Plewe, VP Administration, presented information on the Eccles-Graf project. They addressed safety issues, ADA issues, limited access and displaced programs due to poor facilities. They further commented on upcoming accreditation which takes facilities into account and the \$3.5 million in hand of private contributions made by community. The project has been ranked by the Building Board and Regents near the top of their lists. The business plan has been completed and this is a replacement building. Rep. Clark commented on growth and whether the package savings are attainable and Sen. Evans inquired about enrollment figures.

The Analyst responded to questions on package savings and stated they are actual dollar savings in construction costs.

## **8. Snow college**

Interim pres. Richard Wheeler, Snow College, and Gerald Day, former president Snow College, presented the mission of Snow. It is a residential college environment and the Performing Arts building will address the needs of students who live in town. It is a small college with more FTE's than students, most of the students live in town. There are more music students than student involved with athletics at Snow. There is no music building and the theater needs to be replaced. The addition they once had was demolished and the current building, an old donated LDS Church, is restricted by Fire Marshall. This project would provide instructional space for the students. Their music program is accredited and one of high quality in spite of the physical limitations. This building is the number one priority for Snow. There is no private money committed to this facility but a scholarship endowment is in place for the music program.

The Analyst recommends that if funds become available the Dixie project would be first and then the Snow Fine Arts building. Snow's estimates are \$19.9 million and DFCM estimate is \$18.8 million. Most of the difference between the two figures is in reduced escalation costs. If the construction moves forward now it would save money. Reps. Goodfellow and Barrus commented on the facility. Rep. Pace inquired about construction savings and what numbers are used to determine those savings. Sen. Evans commented on the limited practice time at the current building.

## **9. SLCC**

Mr. Walthers stated that he does not recommend anything this year for SLCC. They are on the five year planning list and while the Auto Trades building has been requested, he does not feel that it is as pressing as other issues. He also commented that the school district will not be using it jointly with SLCC as was projected last year.

Richard Rhodes, VP Business Services, explained that the Auto Trades Building is adaptive reuse. The building will be vacant this summer and it is a good time to do renovations. This renovation is primarily seismic and ADA related. After the building is vacated programs will be moved into the facility regardless of renovation and retrofitting at a later date will be more difficult. There are two master plans, the Jordan Campus Master plan and the Larry Miller campus. SLCC is developing partnerships and has donors for the baseball field at the Jordan Campus. All buildings will be donated at the Larry Miller campus. SLCC has worked with the community but they need \$4 million now for renovation and the timing is good.

Rep. Pace requested an explanation of SLCC Art House project funding that would be used for the Auto Trades building. Mr. Rhodes explained that and informed the committee about the partnership with Wasatch Front Trades to which Mr. Walthers referred. They want 100,000 sq ft but that amount is not available and SLCC is willing to share what they have. Rep. Adair asked

about O and M for Trades Building.

Mr. Walthers mentioned non-state funded projects at SLCC and Mr. Rhodes explained about the renovation of Food Services and the Student center at the Redwood Campus. The other \$2 million they refer to in the handout is one-time money from Higher Education to make all twelve SLCC sites wireless. This \$2 million would be matched with \$2 million each from students and business/industry.

#### **10. Other funding**

Information from the Five Year Book was presented and this list has projects from other funding sources. The analyst gave an overview of the Prison Family History Center and told the committee that OVSC has withdrawn its request for the Wasatch Campus. Tab 3, page 30, has a table which shows all of the projects. The table shows the recommendations but not O & M. The table on Page 22 lists the higher education projects. The analyst has an O & M recommendation of \$4 per square foot. The request from the colleges is more, however the analyst's figure is applied to gross square ft which gives the colleges a slight advantage. The Museum of Natural History does not have O and M recommended for them because they have other sources to obtain this. The committee discussed communication about non-state funded projects approved by this committee and the Higher Education committee so that Higher Ed can plan for future O and M requests.

Sen. Evans mentioned agenda items for Wed. not previously listed.

**MOTION:** Rep. Clark moved to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Minutes reported by Sharon Johnson

---

Sen. Beverly Evans  
Committee Co-Chair

---

Rep. Gerry Adair  
Committee Co-Chair